



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,519	04/06/2001	Kevin P. Nasman	3197-000009	6140

27572 7590 02/16/2005

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 828
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER

PHAM, THOMAS K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2121

DATE MAILED: 02/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/827,519

Applicant(s)

NASMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas K Pham

Art Unit

2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 11 and 18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to request for re-consideration filed on 12/07/2004.
2. Claims 2 and 3 are cancelled.
3. Applicant's amendment with respect to the specification for the term "POD" and to the claims necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.

Quotations of U.S. Code Title 35

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2121

Claim Objections

6. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

The claimed subject matter of claims 1, 11 and 18 “a POD interface” is not supported by the original specification. The specification as filed discloses “a standard POD interface” (paragraph 6). Removing the term “standard” would be inconsistent with the specification. Applicants stated in the remarks that removing the word “standard” from the claim would overcome the 35 USC § 112 rejection in last office action. However, the Examiner wants to clarify that the objection is not on the word “standard” but primarily aimed at the term “POD” which was not defined anywhere in the original application. Applicants amendment to paragraph 6 of the specification to further define the term “POD” has sufficiently overcome the 35 USC § 112 rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,195,045 (“Keane”) in view of U.S. Patent 6,131,125 (“Rostoker”).

Regarding claims 1 and 11

Keane teaches a communications interface system for communicating information in a plasma processing system, comprising: a power delivery system component including a communication interface for communicating information that complies with a first protocol (fig. 1 shows Matching Network 10 includes a communication interface 55 for communicating information to

Art Unit: 2121

the user interface 2400). Keane does not teach a portable device coupled between a POD interface and a second communication interface for communicating information therebetween, the second communication interface communicating information that complies with a second protocol, the portable device translating the information between the first protocol and the second protocol and being detachable from the POD interface and the second communication interface; a first communication link for coupling the POD interface to the portable device; and a second communication link for coupling the portable device to the second communication interface. However, Rostoker teaches a portable device (fig. 3A, element 64) coupled between a POD interface and a second communication interface for communicating information therebetween (col. 5 lines 22-33, "the translation circuitry 64 ... the Ethernet side of the cable"), the second communication interface communicating information that complies with a second protocol, the portable device translating the information between the first protocol and the second protocol and being detachable from the POD interface and the second communication interface (col. 5 lines 34-40, "The various components of ... within the Ethernet cable 56"); a first communication link for coupling the POD interface to the portable device (fig. 3A link 76 and connector 78); and a second communication link for coupling the portable device to the second communication interface (fig. 3A link 80 and connector 82) for the purpose of providing communication between two or more digital electronic device with two or more communication protocols. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the smart communication device of Rostoker with the communication interface of Keane because it would provide for the purpose of providing communication between two or more digital electronic device with two or more communication

Art Unit: 2121

protocols.

Regarding claim 4

Rostoker teaches the second protocol is selected from the group of analog interface, USB, Ethernet, Devicenet, Profibus, Modbus, and Infrared Transceiver (fig. 3B).

Regarding claims 5-6 and 12-13

Rostoker teaches the portable device further includes a mass storage device (col. 6 lines 56-67, "The first controller 106' ... using a microprocessor").

Regarding claims 7 and 16

Rostoker teaches the portable device includes a plurality of interface ports for interfacing with more than one communication interface (fig. 7).

Regarding claims 8, 14 and 15

Rostoker teaches the portable device further includes a coprocessor (fig. 7 element 114).

Regarding claim 9

Keane and Rostoker do not teach the second communication interface is a customer interface. However, Rostoker teaches the second interface could be couple to an Ethernet network (fig. 3B) for the purpose of communicating to a network which can include a customer network. Therefore, it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the second interface of Rostoker could be a connection to any network that necessary to the user's environment.

Regarding claims 10 and 17

Keane teaches the power delivery system component is selected from the group of V/I probes, generators, matching networks, and power amplifiers (fig. 1 matching network 20).

Art Unit: 2121

8. Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,195,045 ("Keane") in view of U.S. Patent 6,601,115 ("Yonezawa").

Regarding claim 18

Keane teaches a communication s interface system for communicating information in a plasma processing system, comprising: a generator assembly including a communication interface conforming to a first protocol for communicating information, the communication interface including a communication port for receiving communication signals (fig. 1 shows Matching Network 10 includes a communication interface 55 for communicating information to the user interface 2400). Keane does not teach a first communication link having a first end detachably coupled to a POD interface communication port; an interface portable device detachably coupled between the POD interface and a second communication interface for communicating information therebetween, the second communication interface conforming to a second protocol, the interface portable device converting information flowing between the POD interface and the second communication interface such that information flowing to the second communication interface conforms to the second protocol and information flowing to the POD interface conforms to the first protocol; and a second communication link for detachably coupling the portable device to the second communication interface. However, Yonezawa teaches a first communication link having a first end detachably coupled to a POD interface communication port (fig. 1 link 114); an interface portable device detachably coupled between the POD interface and a second communication interface for communicating information therebetween (fig. 1 device 107a is detachably coupled between element 104 and element 101), the second communication interface conforming to a second protocol, the interface portable device

Art Unit: 2121

converting information flowing between the POD interface and the second communication interface such that information flowing to the second communication interface conforms to the second protocol and information flowing to the POD interface conforms to the first protocol (col. 3 lines 58-67, “one type of interface device ... with different communication protocols”); and a second communication link for detachably coupling the portable device to the second communication interface (fig. 1 link 117) for the purpose handling a plurality of communication protocols without preparing an interface device for each communication protocol. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the communication interface of Yonezawa with the communication interface of Keane because it would provide for the purpose handling a plurality of communication protocols without preparing an interface device for each communication protocol.

Regarding claim 19

Yonezawa teaches the portable device further includes a mass storage device (col. 10 lines 53-65, “the ROM 701 is loaded ... protocol converter means 108a”).

Regarding claim 20

Yonezawa teaches the portable device includes a plurality of interface ports for interfacing with more than one communication interface (fig. 2 shows element 107a has more than one communication interface).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 11 and 18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2121

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner *Thomas Pham*; whose telephone number is (571) 272-3689, Monday - Thursday from 6:30 AM - 5:00 PM EST or contact Supervisor *Mr. Anthony Knight* at (571) 272-3687.

Any response to this office action should be mailed to: **Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria VA 22313-1450**. Responses may also be faxed to the **official fax number (703) 872- 9306**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thomas Pham
Patent Examiner

TP

February 11, 2005


Anthony Knight
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3600